2: Rock K-5 (1934-) 1947 AF16 Southwest China AF16
Sino-Tibetan Border AE3

represented sitting European fashion, with legs down and not crossed as is otherwise the case in images of Buddha. He is adorned like a prince and is always in the attitude of teaching the law. The Yung-ning image (PLATE 228) is three stories or about 30 feet high. It was constructed by Hsiang-ch'eng Tibetans and the interior of the image is filled with Tibetan Classics. The lamasery of Mu-li possesses an equally large image but of heavily gilt copper. Maitreya is considered to be of gigantic size, hence the monster statues erected of him. He is the Chinese Mi-le fo 彌勒佛.

The lama temple is surrounded by rows of small mud-brick houses, the homes of the lamas when in attendance, but usually empty. The entire compound is surrounded by a tamped earth wall with a west, east, and south gate. This wall was built since 1924 as a protection against the Gangkar-ling bandits who dwell to the north-west of Yung-ning, and who have invaded Yung-ning on several occasions for the purpose of looting and burning.

Morality. — The moral state of the Hli-khin population is certainly a peculiar one. The word father is unknown, and it is next to an insult to inquire of a Hli-khin boy as to the whereabouts of his father. They all say they have no father. They all possess an A-gv (maternal uncle); this may be the brother of their mother or their actual father, without their being certain who their father is. They know and acknowledge only an A-gv. This is brought about by the peculiar conditions prevailing among the lamas of Yung-ning. They do not live in the lamasery, but only come to it on important occasions, as at annual festivals, lama dances, etc., or when specially called together by the abbot, who is a son of the late T'u-ssu. At other times they live at their homes where there is no supervision, and as they are supposed to be celibates they do not marry. The result is a horde of illegitimate children who know no father. Furthermore, the reverse of Chinese marital relations prevail among the lay population. In Yung-ning it is the girl who remains in the home, and she takes unto herself a boy as husband whom she keeps as long as he works, and as long as she enjoys his presence. She can send him away at any time, and take unto herself another husband. Her brother, if she has one, may remain with her and he takes the place of the father, and it is he who is addressed as A-gv. The result of this promiscuous sexual intercourse is an enormous amount of syphilis and other venereal diseases. The moral standard of Yung-ning is thus anything but high. Suicide, so common among the Li-chiang Na-khi is, however, totally unknown among the Yung-ning people.[4] (PLATE 229).

2. FROM YUNG-NING TO FENG-K'O ON THE YANGTZE

Kublai Khan's camp. — From the Yung-ning Lamasery the road leads past the old school-house half-way between the monastery and the village of K'ai-chi to a famous and historic spot on the Hli gyi (K'ai-chi River). It is the Jih-yüeh-ho 日月和 (Union of Sun and Moon) (PLATE 212). In

[4] *See:* J. F. Rock, The Romance of K'a-mä-gyu-mi-gkyi in *B.E.F.E.-O.* T. XXXIX, 1939, pp. 1–152.

23:Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 ALl Southeast Asia ALl
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3

17. Review of Tibeto-Burman

SA
121
601
ST
121
●601

The present section has been written with a two-fold view in mind, viz. a provisional reconstruction of the archaic Tibeto-Burman kinship nomenclature and a synthesis of material bearing on the general problem of the factors that have produced changes in this archaic system. It is of course impossible to realize either of these goals in any complete sense. The reconstruction of a set of kinship terms differs very little from the reconstruction of any other group of terms, e.g. those for animals. In each case certain phonetic generalizations must be followed, and in each case original meanings must be assigned to roots on the basis of a series of fluctuating connotations. The difficult problem of "partial equations", in which a given root has a limited distribution, arises here precisely as in any other linguistic field (for a good recent discussion, vide Scherer, 1941). A distinction between the two types of reconstruction can be drawn, however, in the fact that kinship terms constitute a definite system whereas those for animals, parts of the body, or the like, do not constitute such a system. It is fairly evident that, within kinship nomenclature, a semantic shift at one point is likely to be reflected at another, or, in sociological terms, a single factor, e.g. cross-cousin marriage, is likely to produce a series of interrelated changes, whereas this in general does not hold true within other linguistic spheres. In this respect a kinship nomenclature might be compared with

SA 121 601 ST 121 601 a phonemic system, in which similar integration appears. The point is not worth elaborating, since the fact that a kinship terminology does constitute a system hardly relieves us of the task of investigating each element of that system, both independently and correlatively.

In any piece of historical reconstruction, linguistic or other, the natural tendency is to make the prototype unduly complex. The writer has often been struck by the complexities shown by hypothetical reconstructed languages as compared with their actual living descendants, as though linguistic evolution always proceeded in the direction of simplification. The number of distinct roots assigned to these reconstructed languages is sometimes of staggering magnitude, and no ingenuity is spared in augmenting this lexicographical harvest. In the present study it would be easy to reconstruct an archaic nomenclature with two or more terms for most relationships, yet such a procedure patently would be futile. It is far better to determine, firstly, which elements are relatively certain, and, secondly, which elements are based largely on "partial equations" and must thus be held in reserve until a basic framework has been set up. Nine roots, eight of which are applied to consanguineal relatives, stand out in our complete Tibeto-Burman series as culled from the foregoing review. These roots constitute the following systems

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

SA
601
193
177
ST
●601
193
177

Tibeto-Burman Terms

*p'i gK		*p'u gF	
*pa K		*p'a F	
*ai FKi		*k'u KB	
*pha yOb			
*ka Ch			
		*mak Sl	

The forms given above can be accepted with some confidence as fair approximations of the archaic Tibeto-Burman roots. All except the affinal term *mak have vocalic finals, and it was on the basis of finals or "rhymes" (medial vowel + final consonant), especially of vocalic finals, that Shafer and the writer were able to work out the main features of Tibeto-Burman phonology. Earlier writers had in general attacked the problem from the most difficult angle, that of initials and tones. Thus, no less a scholar than Laufer is responsible for the following absurd dictum:

> Prefixes as well as final consonants....are of minor importance in the comparative study of Indo-Chinese languages.... the staff of comparison remains the initial consonant and the tone conditioned by it. (TP 17, p. 115).

Prefixes have shown to be of basic importance, while both the initials and the tones have been so influenced by the prefixes that our analysis of them still lags far behind our analysis of the finals. In the above set of terms, however, the only problems in re initials concern the aspiration or lack of aspiration, voicing or unvoicing, of the stop initials of *p'i, *p'u, *p'a, and *k'u. Kukish has *pi g' and *pu gF,

SA 6001 193 197 ST 6001 193 197

but initial aspiration is not well preserved in this group. Mikir has p'i gH, p'u gF, ku < *k'u HB, but po < *pa F. Meithei, which ordinarily preserves aspiration, has pu gF, pa F, and ku Fl (< HB). Kachin has ku HF (< XB) rather than the anticipated *k'u, and Burmese has (ste-)kui oS rather than *k'ui. Tibetan has p'yi gL, p'a F, and k'u FB (< HB), while both Tibetan and Kachin have p'u oS (< gF). It may be that one or more of these roots had a sonant rather than a surd initial. Initial g-, a rare element in our comparative material, is perhaps indicated for the HB root (*gu ~ *g'u), but at present nothing definite can be said on this point.

Only one of the above terms is uncertain as regards final, viz. *ni FSl. Classical Tibetan has no rather than *ni, and Meithei has nom ~ ne rather than *ni, both of which point to an archaic form *noi rather than *ni. The weight of evidence, however, speaks in favor of the reconstruction *ni, from which *noi may have been developed as a doublet root; cf. Kukish *nau yOh, *nou "young, tender", which tend to be confused (vide pt. 15).

The basic gF terms *p'i and *p'u are found together in Garish, Mikir, Meithei, Bru, Kukish, and Burmish-Lolcish (but $p'e^{3}$ gqF < *p'i in Burmese itself, which has a new term [$p'wa^{3}$] for gK). The root *p'i is further retained in its basic meaning in Tibetan, Manauri (perhaps Tibetan loan-word), Bahing, and Vayu, while Chang has retained it in the meaning "gF". In northern TB groups the root *p'u has been applied

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

to oB, viz. in Tibetan, Limbu, Newari (only in combination), Digaro, and Kachin. This semantic interchange also appears in Burmish-Loloish, viz. Moso p'u gF, bu oB, Nyi bu gF, pu oB. The interplay of surd and sonant initials in these Moso and Nyi forms indicates that doublets are involved. In Barish the root *p'i gF (in the form bi) has been applied to oSi, both in the Bodo-Dimasa and Garo divisions of this group, and also retained in its basic meaning. It is clear that these usages are connected with the especial position held by oSb, and that the gP terms function here simply as honorifics. Other TB roots, less widely distributed than the above, show the same type of semantic shift (vide infra). In societies with a patrilineal bias it is only natural that the role of oB should be of more significance than that of oSi, thus perhaps accounting for the relative stability of *p'i as compared with *p'u. It can hardly be without significance that in the single matrilineal group encountered (Barish) the term *p'i gM should have been applied to oSi, in contrast to all other TB groups.

Of the two basic P terms *p'a F and *[illegible] M, the former is the most widely distributed and shows fewer variations. The following groups have this root (*p'a): Tibetan, Kanauri, Byangsi, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Miri, Dhimal, Burmish-Loloish, Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, Mru, and Kukish. This root commonly appears as a masculine affix, but no instance of a transference to "oB" has been uncovered. The

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

root *ma M appears in Tibetan, Kanauri, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Dhimal, Burmish-Loloish, Barish, and Meithei. In Burmese itself it is retained only in the terms ma' Si and a-ma' "feminine suffix", and in the closely-related Maru only in the meaning "MSi". Yru has preserved this root only in the feminine suffix -ma. A transference to the meaning "oSi" is found in the contiguous North Assam groups Dafla and Aka. In Kachin and the extensive Kukish group this root appears to have vanished without leaving a trace.

The two PSb terms *ni and *k'u are also unequally represented in Tibeto-Burman. The root *ni FSi is of almost universal occurrence. In its basic meaning it appears in Tibetan, Gyarung, Kanauri, Thebor, Vayu, Newari, Abor-Miri, Mung, Burmish-Loloish (but not in Burmese itself), Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, and Kukish. Kachin has retained it only in the affinal meaning "WM". Aka, if we can trust our inadequate sources, has applied this root to M, while Limbu has applied it to oSi. Replacement by the term for "oSi" is seen in Dafla, Sho, Changki (Ao), and probably Kadu, while Mongsen (Ao) shows replacement by the term for "oSb". The Dafla material indicates that this is an analytical development ("oSi of F"). Lepcha equates FSi with 'Si in the term nyu ~ nyo, applied to female relatives in the uterine line. This unusual equation also appears in Bahing, which has mo-mo MSi,FSi (from mo < *ma M), and po-po FB (from po < *pa F), yet has ku-ku MB. Distinct terms have been

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

developed in Kachin (mai), which preserves *ai as an affinal term (WM), and in Burmese (mi^3), but *ai is retained in the closely related Maru. The Dimasa term da-de FBi (be-de MB) is likewise distinct.

The much more restricted root *k'u MB is found in its primary meaning in Bahing, Vayu, Abor-Miri, Dafla, Digaro, Mung, Mikir, and Ao. Tibetan has k'u FB, but akhu < *k'u Fi,Bi. Himalayish and Lepcha also have k'u FB, probably because of Tibetan influence. Kachin, Meithei, Ntenyi Rengma, and Anyo Rengma have retained the term in the affinal meaning "HF" (Meithei Fi), and Sema in the affinal meaning "FSiH". Chang (Konyak) has the form ko MB, which cannot with certainty be connected with this root. In the Burmish-Lolo1sh group we can cite only Burmese khui "prefix used with names of persons older or of higher rank than the speaker, or politely of his equals" (ate-khui eB), Akha a-khō B, Ahi khō-pu-li yBiH, and Moso a-gu Bi. The Moso usage is paralleled in the Barish group, where we find Bodo gu-mai, Garo gu-ma Bi. This root cannot be traced in the Naki languages proper, yet can be reconstructed for Nukish on the basis of the Naga terms (supra), and for Nukie in general on the basis of the Mikir and Meithei terms.

The root *nau yBb, occasionally applied either to yB or yBi alone, also to Ch, is well represented in Tibeto-Burman. It appears in the following groups: Tibetan (nu ∼ no), Byangsi (yB), Limbu, Lepcha, Aka, Kachin, Konyak, Barish (yBi), Meithei, Mru (yB), and Nukish (yBb ∼ Ch). The most conspicuous gaps are those in Abor-Miri-Dafla, Mung, and Burmish-Lolo1sh.

SA
601
193
197
ST
●601
193
197

The eighth and last of the basic consanguineal terms is *ŋa Gh, which is found in Tsangla, Bugari, Miju, Abu, Kachin, Kadu, Nung (na-ni D), Pyu, Burmish-Lolodish, Konyak, Barish, Nikir, Meithei, Mru, and Bukish (rarely used for yŏb, as in Poeron and Kyee). Lepcha has a-ŋo < *ŋa ŋgF, a-ŋon gCh (with suffixed -n). This root is conspicuously absent in Tibetan and its dialects (but present in Tsangla, a Bodish language), Himalayish, and Kiranti, i.e. the northern or northeastern band of Tibeto-Burman languages, as well as in the Abor-Miri-Dafla group.

The affinal term *ŋak Sl appears in Tibetan, Lepcha (< *ŋaŋk), Dhimal (< *ŋaŋk), Miri, Kachin (da-ŋa < *dǝ-ŋak), Burmese (ŋa-ŋak), Meithei, Mru, and Bukish, with an additional uncertain occurrence in Byangsi. In view of our generally inadequate data on affinal nomenclatures (e.g. we do not have the term for "Sl" in Nung, where we should expect to find this root), the widespread distribution of this root is of increased significance. It would appear that the root is lacking in Himalayish, Nikir, Konyak, and Barish.

The above set of basic terms is supplemented by a series of roots of restricted distribution. Some of these serve mainly as replacements for the basic roots, while others are functionally more independent. Since our set of basic terms is not complete, we must assume that some of these roots represent archaic Tibeto-Burman elements, but this point is best discussed after the various secondary roots have been analyzed.

SA 601 193 197 ST ●601 193 197

The gP roots *p'i gM and *p'u gP have no serious rivals in Tibeto-Burman. A curious link between Tibetan and Southern Naki is suggested by the following set of terms: Tib. po ~ spo gP (literary or dialectical), rmo gM (literary), and Sho a-pŏ ~ a-pŏk gP, Chinbon kh-mo gM, Yindu kh-mo gP. A possible root *si is indicated by Balti as-si (= a-si) ggM, Rung a-si gM, Khami a-um-si gP, and Kadu a-si MSi (i-si "woman"), Yindu kh-si FSi, Sho a-si FSi,oSi (cf. the roots *ta and *tei, infra). In general, gP terms show more variation than do P terms; thus, Kachin has developed distinct terms for both gM (woi) and gP (ji), and note forms such as Byangsi ti-ti gP, Bahing and Vayu ki-ki gP.

The most conspicuous of the secondary P roots is *nu M, which appears in Kachin, Miju, Sak, Konyak, Kukish, and perhaps Nikir and Meithei (in combination). The root *pui "mother, female" is restricted to Nikir and Kukish. The Kukish feminine affix *la, used especially of young females, seems to have given rise to Mongsen-Changki (Ao) a-la M, Ntenyi Rengma a-la ggM, Anyo Rengma a-la gM, and cf. Byangsi la-la gM, Sunwari a-la Si. The same root (*la) appears in Kachin, Burmish-Loloish, and elsewhere as a masculine affix. The Tibeto-Burman root *wa "male" serves to explain both Bunan and Kachin wa, Kadu a-wa, Garo (dialects of A type) a-wa F (Mosbang and Ramsang wa F probably through Kachin influence), Aka au < *a-wa F, Burmese we-kri[3] "term of address to old men" (Arakanese dialect), and Lepcha a-vo < *wa, Meithei (ma-)wa, Kukish wa H; cf. also Digaro ma-wa "male",

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Bhimal -ca "masculine suffix", Bodo hoca "male". Some of these forms, however, may have resulted from a phonetic development from *p'a F (probably via *ba).

A root *mei or *me appears sporadically in Tibeto-Burman, sometimes with a dental suffix. This root is parallel to, but distinct from, TB *ma M. The following forms belong here: Tibetan -med "woman" (in bud-med < *bu-med, paralleling bu-mo), Gyarung te-mi ~ te-me "woman", Kanauri -med (suffix in "D" and "Ml"), Chamba Lahuli me "bitch", Limbu met W, Lepcha a-mit "woman", Ende a-me M, Rung a-me M (cf. Rung a-p'a F), Burmese a-mi^{3} ~ a-me M, and Garo me-cik "woman, wife". Note also the series formed by Burmese sa-mi^{3}, Aka sa-mi, Rung za-mi D (from *ma Ch). Garo ga-me Bl, Mikir me SiH correspond phonetically but can scarcely be fitted in otherwise.

In addition to the above, there are traces of a set of roots *ya and *yu, both applied to female relatives. The former is better attested than the latter; cf. Himalayish (Manchati, Kanashi, Chamba Lahuli) ya M, Aber-Miri and Dafla yo < *ya gN (but in Pagri Miri used for "M" in address), Tshaleng (Konyak group) ya M, Naga *ya M, also Kanauri yas, Kaa (Kiranti) ma-ya, Burmese ma-ya^{3} W, Digaro mi-ya "woman", ha-mi-ya W. The root *yu is represented only by Kanauri yu-med, Khambu (Kiranti) yuh, Lepcha a-yu W, Lepcha ta-yu "woman", and perhaps Tibetan yu-mo "female of a stag".

Nothing has yet been said of oSb terms, which show a wide variety of forms contrasting with the standard ySb root (*mam

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Much of the material in this connection is of a scattered nature from which it is difficult to draw any conclusions. Thus, Byangsi kya, Bahing ya oB, Meithei ye-ma oB, Chorte (Old Kuki) a-ya H, ai-ya oBi, and Khami ya-et ~ ya-i oB suggest an archaic root *ya oB, yet this same element appears in another setting (supra). Burmese sta-hmi < *ik-hui oB, Mikir ik oB lack cognates elsewhere, as do Maru pai oBi, Chonbok pai oBi(ws), unless the latter pair be connected with Burmese a-pai "madam" and perhaps Mikir pei ~ pe M. The characteristic Kukish root u oBb (Central, Northern, and Old Kuki groups only) does not appear elsewhere in this setting, yet appears to be identical to Sho ü M, Taungthu u M, Maru u M, and Burmese u^3 MB (prefixed to names of men considerably older than the speaker), perhaps also Tangkhul a-ŭ̀ gF,MB.

Three or four roots, however, stand out more prominently than the above lot and deserve especial consideration. Tibetan c'e oBi(ws) has been compared with Himalayish *c'e "female" as represented by Kanauri c'ets "female, woman", Kanashi c'ets W (with diminutive suffix -ts) and with the Byangsi-Chaudangsi term c'e xC, as well as with Johar a-ce ^{pr} The above terms all point to a TB root *c'ei. A similar root, but apparently with unaspirated initial (*cei), is represented by Konyak jei ~ cei oBb ~ oB, Meithei ce oBi, Tangkhul cei oBb, Western Kuki *cei oBb, Anyo Rengma a-ce oBb. The Tibetan term appears to be etymologically connected with the word c'e-ba "great", from which the respectful term gsen-po oB has been developed.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

A root *ma cSi appears in Maruri, Vayu, Kachin, Andro, and Konyak, while the Akawra and Abor-Miri-Dafla groups have *ma N, and Lakher has the voestive term i-ma N. Tibetan ma Dl perhaps also belongs here, though it may be of periphrastic origin (< sma "oath").

The Tibeto-Burman root *ta (often in the form da) is consistently applied to relatives older than Ego, if one regards the Kuking-Vayu root *ta CR as of distinct origin. The following terms can be grouped with this root: Tibetan 'a-ta F (dialectical), oB (Eastern Tibet), Tsangla a-ta oB, Gyarung a-ta-ta F, Johar a-ta cSi, Byangsi ta-ta cSi, Newari ta-ta cSi, Miri and Dafla a-te < *ta gF, Digaro ta gF, da oB, Burmese t'a^{3}-t'a^{3} F (dialectical), Akha a-ta F, Independent Lolo a-da F, Sho a-ta oB, Chinhon (ka-)t'a oB, Lhota a-ta oSb, Changki (Ao) a-ta FSi,oSi, Naong Rengma a-da FoB. Doublet forms are found only in Digaro (ta gF, da oB). Unlike *p'a gF,oB this root has also been applied to F in some languages (Tibetan, Gyarung, Burmese, Akha). Desgodins describes the Tibetan term 'a-ta as a "children's word" (vox puerorum), and in Independent Lolo a distinction is made between a-ta F (used by children) and a-bu ~ a-bo F (used by adults).

Kanauri te-te gF, a-te oB are clearly of a type paralleling that described above. The suggested TB root is *tei, with which can be grouped Byangsi te-te zC(ss), Dafla tĕ-tĕ FyB,oB (in different sources), Kadu a-te cSi, Banpara a-tai oB, Mikir te cSi(ss), Maithei i-tei-ma cSil, and Kru a-tai BK.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

An objection might be raised to the above discussion on the ground that forms such as *na, *ta, and *tei (te) are of "nursery word" type and should not be regarded as representing actual TB roots. The writer himself originally ascribed to this general point of view, but the collection of material on which this study is based has led him to discard it. Thus, ta F appears both in the West Tibetan dialects (Balti, Purik) and in the nomad dialects of Eastern Tibet, as well as in the aberrant Gyarung language, whence we can safely infer a Bodish root *ta F. The term na oSi appears in five distinct languages representing two different foci (Murmi-Vayu and Kachin-Andro-Konyak), and na N in two isolated groups (Almora and Abor-Miri-Dafla). Distributions of this type are scattered, to be sure, yet not entirely random. The cluster of connotations (gP,P,oSb) around these roots is also not without significance.

The majority of the terms for Sb(ds) are of limited distribution. Tibetan sring-mo Si(ms), dialectically used for ySi, appears also in Himalayish (Si) and Byangsi (ySi), with an additional possible occurrence in Dhimal-Toto (Si). Kachin jan < *jar Si(ms), often used for ySi, is directly related to Kukish *dzar Si(ms), which in Western Kuki is used for ySi, and to Meithei i-cal ~ i-can ySi, Kadu sen, Sengmai cil ySi. Kachin yung B(ws) has been compared with the Garo-Dimasa root *yung yB. The tendency to equate Sb(ds) with ySb is reflected in all three roots.

The roots *nau ySb and *za Ch are of almost universal occurrence and have no serious rivals. The former is

SA 6001 193 197 ST ●6001 193 197

conspicuously absent in Burmish-Lolcish, which has a root *nyi (ní), comparable with Lepcha nyi-t'i gCh. A root *nga is suggested by Murmi and Gurung a-nga ySi, Miri ăng-ă ySb, Dafla ang-a Ch, Naga *nga Ch. Isolated roots *a Ch and *ka Ch are represented by Digaro a, Abor-Miri o < a Ch, and Newari ka, Abor-Miri ko < *ka Ch, respectively.

It will be noted that the set of basic terms presented above lacks all collateral terms as well as a gCh term. Our data on collateral terms are incomplete for many groups, so that negative evidence here is of relatively little value, but it would seem that no root or roots for xC have been developed. The only root of any extension here is *ning, which appears in Kachin (xCe,ws), Chang (xC), Mikir BW(ws), and perhaps Garo (Sbl). The Mikir and Garo affinal meanings can be explained in terms of cross-cousin marriage.

Three or perhaps four TB roots show a tendency to equate H with gCh. Tibetan ts'a Ne (probably SiS,ms),gCh furnishes an example of this tendency. Bahing and Newari have this root (*ts'a) in the meaning "gS", but in the Kiranti languages in general it is used for "S" (see the discussion in pt. 4). Kanauri c'ad Sl (with suffixed -d) has been brought into comparison via SiS(ms), equated with Sl under cross-cousin marriage. Kachin ta'a MB,MBS(ws) can be explained only on the basis of a reciprocal development from SiS(ms). Mikir c-sa SiS(ms),Sl shows an ideal agreement on the semantic side, but the comparison is phonetically dubious. The root *ts'a appears to be lacking in other groups.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The roots *su and *tu have distributions which are almost, if not quite, mutually exclusive. *Su gCh appears in Kachin, Bodo, Mikir, and Meithei, while *tu appears in Nung (N), Burmish-Loloish (xN), and Kukish (FSiCh,SiCh,ms,gCh). Anu, a Southern Kuki language, has su xC,ySi(ws),SiCh(ws),gCh, and a-su-lai SiCh(ms), covering much the same ground as Kukish *tu. The roots *su and *tu must be regarded as distinct on general phonetic grounds, and this view is strengthened by the evidence from Meithei, which has i-su gCh as well as (ma-)tu W (cf. the Kuki use of *tu in the meaning "Sl", through cross-cousin marriage). The root *su is perhaps also represented in the Naga languages, in much the same setting as Anu su, viz. Angami cu ~ tsu FSiS,ySiS(ms),gS, Nzong Rengma a-cu-gü, Ntenyi Rengma a-zu-wa, Anyo Rengma a-zü FSiCh,SiCh(ms),gCh, but our knowledge of Naga phonology is not sufficiently advanced to establish this comparison.

A fourth root of the same general type is *ma-li, which is found in Nung (gCh), Burmish-Loloish (gCh), Pyu (gCh), Chang (xN), Garo (SiS,ms), Mikir (xN, probably BCh,ws), and has an additional cognate in Kachin (ma-li "young man"). This root is in general lacking in Kukish, but may be represented by Taungtha lwi Ne,Ni and Yindu (ka-)li BD(ws). It cannot be traced in Tibetan or any of the northern languages.

The affinal root corresponding to *mak Sl is perhaps *nam Dl, but the evidence for the latter root is not altogether satisfactory. Lepcha has nyom < *snam Dl paralleling myok < *smak Sl, and s- prefixed forms are also represented by

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 Kanauri stem < *snom (probably for snăm) Dl, and Barish *snam Dl (based on Dimasa ba-ham, Garo nam). Cf. also Gyarung snon < *snam Si, Burmese hnaṁ < *snam ySi(ms) (inferred from mong-hnam "H and W", where mong means "yS,wa"), Lashi tu-nam Dl, nam-po ySi(ms), Nyi nŏ-mo < *nam-mo ySi(ms), and Lushei hnăm < *snăm "clan". The unprefixed form appears in Byangsi nam-sia Dl, Kachin nam Dl,ySil, and Nung nam Sb, while Lepcha has both nyom < *snam Dl and nom < *nam oSi. Magari ar-năm "girl" also belongs in this series.

Of more restricted distribution are the roots *mou Dl, represented by Kukish mou (Lushei mo), Meithei i-mau, and perhaps Tibetan mo "woman", and *k'rwi Sl, represented by Kachin k'ri Sl,SiCh(ms), Burmese k'rwe^{3}-ma^{1} < *k'rwi^{3}-ma^{1}, Lisu c'i-ma Dl (with feminine suffix -ma), and perhaps Lepcha tă-gri "male". The original meanings of these roots may have been simply "female" and "male", respectively.

There remain for consideration a few poorly represented roots connected primarily with the PSb nomenclature. Nung a-tsim MSi is comparable with Tsangla a-zim, id., and Nung a-wang FB with Garo a-wang FyB, also Lashi vang-mo HF,FoSiH, Maru vung ~ vun HF,FSiH (but the Lashi and Maru terms suggest a meaning "MB" rather than "FB"). The *wang series is perhaps connected with Tibetan 'a-bang FSiH,MSiH (literary), Limbu (am-)pang-a "uncle", Vayu pong-pong < *pang-pang FB.

Tibetan sru MSi has been compared with Kanauri and Chamba Lahuli ru Fl, Pyu sru "relatives", and the reconstructed

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Lolo root *ru MB. If these terms actually constitute a true series, we must reconstruct a root *mru ~ *ru "mother's relatives" (neuter), whence Kanauri ru Fl < MB through cross-cousin marriage, paralleling Kanauri c'ad Sl < SiS(ms). The presence of this root in Pyu, at approximately the year A.D. 1000, lends some weight to this view.

The fourth Tibetan PSb term, viz. ʾa-v̌zang MB, is found in this form in Thebor and Lepcha, where it must be regarded as a loan-word, but not elsewhere. This form can be derived from an original *zrang and thus compared with Mru ta-rang FSiH,HF, Kukish ta-rang~ ma-rang, id., and probably Lhota o-ra̰, Changki (Ao) (kȟ-)hram Bl(ws). Burmese a-hrang < *arang (archaic spelling is a-hsyang) "lord, master" also perhaps belongs here rather than with sring-mo Si (supra). The writer has long suspected that Tibetan initial v̌z- and v̌s- have in many instances been derived from zr- and sr-, respectively, partly because of the general instability of these clusters in Tibetan (cf. srab-srib ~ hrab-hrib ~ rab-rib "dim, obscure"), and partly on the basis of comparative material, viz. Tib. v̌sig "louse", Bunan v̌srig, Lushei hrik < *srik; Tib. v̌zag "day (24 hours)", Burmese rak, id.; Tib. v̌sags "joke, jest" (in sense of "ridicule"), Bunan v̌srag "shame", Burmese hrak < *srak "to be ashamed". The root *-rang (prefixed) must have had a generalised honorific force (still retained in Burmese), and thus was admirably suited as a periphrastic term either for MB or for FSiH,HF (= MB under cross-cousin marriage).

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Having completed our review of Tibeto-Burman kinship roots, we are now faced with the problem of fixing the basic pattern of nomenclature for this linguistic family. The terms designating relatives in the central line of descent naturally form the most stable segment of the nomenclature, while the collateral terms show an intermediate, and the affinal terms a maximum, amount of variation.

Within this stable core of nomenclature we are able to distinguish two primary gP terms (gM and gF), two primary P terms (M and F), a neuter ySb term, and a neuter Ch term. The two neuter terms are often employed in a masculine sense (yB and B), with sex affixes used in forming the corresponding feminine terms (yBi and D), e.g. Tibetan bu S, bu-mo D, Burmese sa^3 S, $sa\text{-}mi^3$ D. No neuter F terms have been uncovered, but Chang has a neuter gP term (a-pi < *p'i gM) used only in address, and a neuter gP term is also found in Sema (a-pu-sa), and in the Southern Kuki languages Sho (a-pŏ) and Ayaing Khami (a-[illegible]-ei). Three Southern Kuki languages (Chinbok, Yindu, Anu) make a distinction between FM and MM, but have a single term for gF (Anu FM < M, MM < gM). Four gP terms appear only in rare instances, and are never all primary. Both Tibetan and Kanauri show traces of three or four gP terms, but Kanauri has probably borrowed one or more of its gP terms from Tibetan, and the Tibetan material itself can be interpreted in more than one way. Kachin seems to employ four gP terms, perhaps because of Shan influence, but has only two primary terms (ji gF and woi gM). Garo distinguishes

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

between "gP" (= FF) and "gM" (= FM), and "my gP" (= MF) and "my gM" (= MM), if we can trust our sources for this language. In view of the fact that the Garo are a matrilineal group, this point is of some interest. Chang, which uses the neuter term a-pi gP in address, employs four terms in reference, the FF and FM terms being formed through affixed sex elements, and the MF and MM terms through analysis. Finally, Laiyo, which has an almost exclusively analytical nomenclature, employs four analytical gP terms.

A number of different arrangements of Sb terms have been encountered. Age distinctions appear everywhere and are, in general, more prominent than sex distinctions. Despite this, however, it would appear that the basic pattern has two primary terms for oB and oSi, contrasting with the single neuter ySb term (=anu). As has been shown above, the widespread tendency to equate oB and oSi with terms for relatives of ascending generations has obscured the general picture here and has made analysis almost impossible. The simplest possible arrangement (oSb and ySb) has been found only in Khamti (Ayaing and Awa) and Amyo Rongma. A single primary term for oSb appears also in Naki proper (u) and in Burmese (ate-), but Burmish-Lolotish in general has two primary oSb terms. Nzong Rongma shows a complete reversal of the ordinary pattern, with terms for oSb, yB, and ySi. Tibetan, Lepcha, Dafla, Kachin, Aka, Lisu, Chang, Chinbon, Ao and probably other less accurately recorded languages have what appears to be the basic arrangement, viz. oB, oSi, and ySb (three primary

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

terms). The Karish languages in general employ the root *nau ySb in the meaning "ySi" and have developed a new term for yB (perhaps connected with the Kachin term for B,ws), while Meithei reverses this process in employing *nau for "yB" and the Kukish root *dzar·Si(ms) for ySi. Simple terms for either B or Si are almost entirely lacking in Tibeto-Burman. Abor-Miri has terms for B and Si based on a root *buir (cf. a-buir "friend"), while in Dafla the cognate form *bör is used as the root for ySb, but note that Abor-Miri also possesses especial terms for oSb and ySb. Mikir kor Sb, like Abor-Miri buir, also has the more general meaning "friend".

Though the principle of age distinctions can be established as a basic feature of Tibeto-Burman kinship terminology, the status of sex-of-speaker distinctions is not so readily settled. We are handicapped here by the fact that most of our sources can not be depended upon in showing non-European distinctions of this type, and that negative evidence is therefore of little value. Distinct terms for Si(ms) and B(ws) are found in Tibetan, Kachin, Lushei and Lakher (and probably other Kuki languages), and Angami. Lushei and Lakher also have a distinct term (of periphrastic origin) for Si(ws). In Burmese and Nyi the distinction is applied only to ySb, viz. Burmese yB(ms), yB(ws), ySi(ws), ySi(ms), Nyi ySb(ss), yB(ws), ySi(ms), and Maru, in the same linguistic group, has a distinct term for yB(ws). Mikir distinguishes between oSi(ms) and oSi(ws), and has a distinct term for B(ws). Chinbok and Yindu, in the Southern

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Bahl group, have a full set of eight Mb terms, showing complete distinctions both for age and for sex-of-speaker. The Chinbok system can be reduced to five primary terms, viz. pai oSi(ws), pwo oS(ms), mau ySb(ss), bo Si(ms), and bang B(ws), i.e. the Tibetan-Kachin arrangement. Sex of speaker appears not to be distinguished in Kanauri, Abor-Miri, Dafla, Barish, Meithei, and some other languages, but our sources, as mentioned above, are not of the most dependable sort. In view of the weight of evidence above, from such key languages as Tibetan, Kachin, Burmese, Mikir, and Lushei, the writer is inclined to regard the sex-of-speaker distinction as an archaic Tibeto-Burman feature.

Despite the fact that no single gCh root can with certainty be reconstructed for Tibeto-Burman, one can surely regard the presence of a primary gCh term as a basic feature for this linguistic family. Aside from the tendency to equate gCh with N or C (vide infra), it can be stated that most Tibeto-Burman languages have a distinct, usually primary, term for gCh, e.g. Kachin ˇsu, Burmese mrə̌, Byangsi k'we, Kanauri o'ay, Lepcha a-sem, Chang ˇsi, Garo and Mikir su, Meithei i-su. If a single gCh root must be predicated, TB *su must be regarded as the most likely selection. Equations of gCh other than with N are exceptional, but note Sema a-nu gCh= Ch(< TB *nsu ySb).

The above discussion is resumed in the following diagram:

23:Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 ALI Southeast Asia ALI
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3

SA
601
143
147
ST
601
143
147

Tibeto-Burman Basic Pattern

gM (*p'i)		gF (*p'u)
M (*ma)		F (*p'a)
oS1(ws)	y3b (*nsu)	oB(ms)
S1(ms)		B(ws)
	Ch (*za)	
	gCh	

It would be a rather hazardous undertaking to attempt any general explanation of the pattern outlined above in terms of sociological factors. A broad theory of this type must be based on a comprehensive comparative survey of Tibeto-Burman with a number of other groups, and as such lies outside the scope of the present study. Many of the variations from this pattern are undoubtedly significant, but they involve those elusive culture-linguistic intangibles which do not lend themselves to arm-chair analysis. It is only in the collateral and affinal nomenclatures that obvious cultural correlations are available, and it is these that the writer proposes to consider in some detail.

The distinction between cross (FS1 and MB) and parallel (FB and MS1) FSb terms is almost universal in Tibeto-Burman. No instances of an equation of FB with MB have been encountered, but FS1 and MS1 are equated in Bahing, Lepcha, and Chinbon, if we can trust our sources. Note that Lepcha also equates xC with pC, and that cross-cousin marriage is forbidden in this tribe.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The parallel FB and MSi terms are usually either equated with the F and M terms (as in Chang, Lushei, Angami, Sema) or are based on these terms, with the addition of elements meaning "big" and "little" or the like. In other words, age distinctions are made in the parallel FSb terms precisely as in the Sb terms, though with categorical rather than primary elements. By way of contrast, the cross FSb terms seldom show these age distinctions, but note Burmese u^3-ri^3 MoB (cf. a-ri^3 FSi), u^3-$mang^3$ MyB, Chinbok pu-srŏ MoB (= gF), pu-ko MyB (these distinctions are typical of Southern Kuki in general). Some of the more characteristic examples of age distinctions in FB terms are listed below:

Language	FoB	FyB
Balti	'a-ta ts'ar-ma	a-ta tsun-tso
Lepcha	a-bo-tim	a-bo-cum
Kachin	wa-di	wa-doi
Burmese	p'ŭ-kri^3	p'ŭ-t'we^3
Hyi	a-ba-giĕ	a-ba-ʎə
Haka	pa-u	pa-nau
Siyin	pa-lien	pa-no
Chinbon	pa k-dŏm	pa k-cwi
Tangkhul	a-va k'ŭ-rŭr	a-va ka-tui
Lhota	o-po-ra-mo	o-po-ro

One occasionally encounters what seem to be primary terms for FB or MSi, but most of these can be explained on the basis of ellipsis, e.g. Maru t'ong MySi but nye-t'ang MySi,

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

p'a-t'ang FyB in the closely related Lashi language; Bodo a-yong FoB and a-doi FyB, but ma-gong MoSi and ma-doi MySi; Mzong Rengma a-nyo FyB (nyo Ch), and perhaps Changki (Ao) a-sa FyB < *za Ch. Kanauri has a curious diminutive formation, viz. a-mats MSi < a-ma, and a-pats FB < a-pa. Tibetan and Nung, however, appear to have four true FSb terms. The Nung terms a-tsim MSi and a-wang FB have been compared with Tsangla a-zim MSi and Garo a-wang FyB, respectively. The Tibetan term sru MSi seems to have been derived from a root with the generalized meaning "mother's relatives", or "member of mother's clan, first ascending generation". Tibetan k'u FB, it can now be stated, has been developed from the TB root *k'u MB, and the Himalayish and Lepcha employment of this term in its Tibetan setting must be credited to Tibetan influence, which is conspicuous in both of these areas. Tibetan skud < *k'u Fl,Bl is to be explained in terms of xC marriage and the equation of MB with WF, as elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman. Tibetan 'a-ne FSi,MBW further fits into this picture. In Himalayish, Kanauri ru Fl < *sru MSb, and o'ad Sl < *ts'a SiS(ms) suggest a like reconstruction. We have some material on xC marriage in the Tibetan area, but the term skud itself is, for the writer, the most significant single piece of evidence. Those who minimize the value of linguistic "fossils" in general might well take note of this term.

The semantic shift FB < MB in the Tibetan term k'u still requires explanation. Elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman the term has

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

been demoted to affinal rank or dropped altogether, but nowhere else has it been applied to FB. Now there is but one marital feature in which the Tibetan area (including the Kanauri group of Himalayish) significantly differs from the remaining Tibeto-Burman area, viz. polyandry. Fraternal polyandry of Tibetan type is practised by the Kanauri, almost certainly through Tibetan influence, since this custom is explicitly stated to be absent among the Almora peoples (Byangsi, Chaudangsi, Johar). Among the Lepcha polyandry is an abnormal trait and can unhesitatingly be assigned a Tibetan origin. Among other Tibeto-Burman group for which we have any record, polyandry either is said to be lacking or is simply not mentioned. Since Tibetan polyandry is of fraternal type, the importance of FB can readily be understood. It would seem that the MB term, which is unstable in most TB groups, was first replaced by the honorific term 'a-zang and later applied to FB. The collective term shud-po Fl,Bl, having already been semantically specialized in an affinal sense, was naturally retained.

Primary cross FSb terms are basic TB features, and are represented by the roots *ni FSi and *k'u MB. The first of these two terms, however, is much more stable than the second, and significantly so (if statistically treated). Thus, Tibetan has transferred the MB term to FB and used an honorific for MB; Burmish-Loloish has retained the MB term only as an honorific applied to oB (in Burmese) or as an affinal term

SA (Ahi, Mose) and has developed new terms for MB (Burmese u^3,
601 Lolo *ru); the Kuki languages proper have dropped the MB term
193 altogether and equated MB with gF; in the Naga group the MB
197 term has been preserved in its original setting only in Ao,
ST while in Rengma and Sema it has been retained only in the
● 601 affinal nomenclature. All of these groups, however, have the
193 root *ni FSi in its original setting. Burmese (but not
197 Burmish-Loloish) has replaced both the FSi and MB terms and dropped the former altogether, while Kachin has retained both terms only in its affinal nomenclature. The relatively greater stability of the FSi term is also evident in the borrowings made by various TB groups (infra).

This "differential variability" in the FSi and MB terms must be viewed in connection with the affinal application of these terms and the whole problem of cross-cousin marriage. Under bilateral xC marriage MB becomes Fl, and FSi becomes Ml, and it is not unlikely that honorific terms should become associated with these socially "pivotal" relationships. The fact that the MB=Fl term is more susceptible to this process than is the FSi=Ml term merely reflects the general patrilineal bias of Tibeto-Burman societies. The equation of MB with gF, which plays so prominent a role in Kukish, represents one aspect of this whole development, but teknonymy may also be a factor here ("Fl" designated as "gF of my son"). Teknonymy is hardly typical of Tibeto-Burman yet does occasionally occur. Lepcha, for example, employs a-bo F for Fl

SA 1601 193 197 ST 1601 193 197 where the couple are childless, but t'i-kung gF after the birth of a child, and the descriptive term a-fyat Fl has been derived from an original *sput, which in turn represents a morphological development from the TB root *p'u gF. Vayu ca-k'i Fl appears to be a combination of co < *ca Ch and ki-ki gF. Lahu, in the Southern Lolo group, has a-p'u gF= Fl, a-p'i gM=Ml, and Ahi, in the Northern Lolo group, has su-p'o WF, also "paternal ancestor". The Chang Sbl terms are of teknonymous origin, e.g. hau-ko Bl(ms)="his MB", but the Chang Fl terms are simply Fl=MB and Ml= FSl. Chinbon equates WF with gF, and WM with gM (rather than with MB and MBW, as in most Kuki languages), but retains the Kuki pattern in the HM and HF terms (HF= FSl, and especial term for HF), i.e. the teknonymous (or honorific) terms are employed only by the husband. The Mirish languages (Abor, Miri, Dafla) afford the best illustration of teknonymy. In Miri the terms a-bu and a-nĕ are used for F and M, respectively, but in the closely related Abor language these terms are applied to gF and gM, though ta-ta (Miri ta-to gF) is retained as the vocative term for gF. In this instance the child has taken over his parents' terms ("reverse teknonymy") rather than the parent his childrens' terms. Abor also uses the vocative gF term (ta-ta) for Fl, while Miri equates Fl either with gF or with MB, and Ml either with gM or with FSl (the equations with MB and FSl are probably only descriptive, though this is not stated in our sources). Dafla equates Ml with gM, probably also Fl with gF.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Under a system of bilateral xC marriage we should expect to find both WF and HF equated with MB, and both WM and HM equated with FSi. This condition is fulfilled in Byangsi and Abor-Miri, where this type of marriage is in vogue. The terminological equation also appears, however, in Nung, Chang, Sema, Nzong Rengma, and Lhota, for all of which preferential MBD marriage is indicated, and in Tangkhul and Angami, for which xC marriage cannot be established.

A system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD should lead to the equation of WF with MB, HM with FSi, and separate terms for HF and WM, as well as distinctions between FSiH and MB, MBW and FSi. Kachin fulfills all these conditions admirably, with unilateral xC marriage coupled with the terminological equations indicated above. The same can be said for the Kuki pattern, as illustrated in Lakher, Thado, Chawte, Tarau, as well as in Mru and Khami, viz. WF=MB, WM=MBW, HM=FSi, HF=FSiH. Unilateral MBD marriage is found among the Thado, Chiru, Anal, Aimol, Purum, and probably the Anal, Sho, and Khami. In Thado this nomenclature is employed only where MBD marriage has actually occurred, P terms being employed under other conditions.

Ntenyi and Anyo Rengma have an intermediate type, with M1=FSi but WF=MB and a distinct term for HF, but in both languages the MB term is sometimes applied to HF as well as to WF. The closely related Nzong Rengma has a single term for F1 (WF,HF=MB), but retains a distinct term for FSiH. Sema has the same scheme as Nzong Rengma. The Sema term for FSiH,

SA
601
193
197
ST
•601
193
197

furthermore, is cognate with the Ntenyi and Anyo Rengma term for HF, and in Ao the same term appears in its original setting (MB). This Naga material thus shows various stages of the transformation of the affinal terminology through the development of unilateral xC marriage. The discrepancies found in Nung, Chang, and Lhota are perhaps more apparent than real, and in the case of Nung and Lhota, at any rate, our sources may be faulty. Even in these affinal features, however, we must expect to find a certain amount of disassociation, for we must allow for linguistic "lag", i.e. the simple scheme of equating F1 with MB and M1 with FSi tends to be perpetuated even where the development of a unilateral "skew" has rendered it theoretically illogical. This general point has been raised many times before, but will bear repetition in view of the fact that a number of modern theoreticians seem to object to this sort of reasoning.

It is fairly evident that the abandonment of xC marriage as an institutionalized norm has in several different groups resulted in the disappearance of categorical equations. In Tibetan and Kanauri we have only the "fossilized" terms skud-po and ru, respectively, which require comparative studies for a full appraisal of their significance. In Lahul, however, where we have a hint of xC marriage, the equations F1=MB and M1=FSi are in evidence. In Burmese itself categorical equations are lacking, and here also we have no evidence of xC marriage, but the situation is reversed in Arakanese (Chaungtha).

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, equate M1 with FSi, WF with MB, and have a distinct term for FSiH,HF (as in Nsong and Anyo Rengma). Kachin influence perhaps plays a role here, yet the Kachin distinguish between WM and HM, as is consistent with their unilateral xC marriage practice. Nyi, in the Northern Lolo group, has derived its terms for WF and WM from the terms for MB and FSi, respectively, plus the element mo "old", acting here as an honorific, while the Burmish-Loloish affinal root *yok is employed in the terms for HM and HF. Ahi seems to reverse this scheme, to judge from our faulty data on this language. For Lisu we have only what appear to be the vocative terms for F1 and M1 (ma-ma < a-ma M, ba-ba < a-ba F), and hence are not in a position to interpret this Lolo material. The use of respectful designations may be a complicating factor here; cf. Lushei pu-zon WF, pi-zon WM, conforming to the Kuki pattern (from pu MB and pi MBW plus an added element -zon), but pa HF (= F) and nu HM (= M), i.e. a woman equates her husband's relatives with her own blood kin.

Categorical equations in the F1 terms are present elsewhere, but our sources are often incomplete. Garo equates M1 with FSi,MBW, but has a distinct term for F1 (a-bu-di, perhaps "little gF"). Mikir equates WF with MB, WM with FSi (with or without the addition of an honorific suffix), and has a distinct term for HF. If we assume that HM (not given in our sources) is also equated with FSi, this system can be compared with that found in Rengma and Maru. Both Garo and Mikir have

SA 601 193 197 preferential MBD marriage. Meithei equates Ml with FSi, and has i-ku Fl < TB *k'u MB (the MB term is not known for sure, but may be the Indic loan-word māmā); the Meithei are not known to practice xC marriage.

ST 601 193 197 The rest of the collateral terminology (C and N terms) is even more poorly known than the PSb terminology, and presents even more serious problems. In view of the presence of basic TB roots for MB (*k'u) and FSi (*ni) one might expect to find one or more roots for xC, but such is hardly the case. The extension of Sb terms to include pC is practically universal and need not be examined in detail. The lack of especial xC terms is probably associated with the lack of xC marriage, but there are too many lacunae in our data to permit of any final judgment here. Tibetan apparently fails to distinguish between pC and xC, but Burmese perhaps has a distinct xC term (sa-mi^{3}-mrok-sa^{3}, lit. "D's spouse"!). By way of contrast, Chaungtha, one of the Arakanese dialects, has yauk-pa Bl,xC corresponding to Burmese yok-p'a$^{\cdot}$ Bl(ms), in conformity with its equation of Fl with MB and Ml with FSi, i.e. an affinal term has "invaded" the consanguineal nomenclature.

Terms for xCe and xCi in conjunction with xC marriage are found in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, Lisu, and Chang, while Dafla has this terminological pattern but without data on xC marriage. Chang appears to have preferential MBD marriage, but the bilateral type is found among the others.

SA 601 193 197 Byangsi-Chaudangsi makes a sex-of-speaker distinction, viz. xC1(ms), xCe(ws), xC(ss), and Abor-Miri makes an age distinction. None of the terms involved is associated with a PSb term or a N term. The Abor-Miri terms show "invasion" from the affinal terminology, as in Chaungtha, e.g. nag-bo

ST ●601 193 197 xCe(os) = oBl,Sl, from TB *mak Sl. Note that in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, and Chang this xC pattern is associated with the simple Pl = PSb categorical equations (for Lisu we lack full information on the Pl terms).

Cross-cousin terminologies of Omaha type are found in two primary foci, viz. Kachin and Kukish. The correlation between the Omaha nomenclature and patrilineal descent, one of the few widely accepted anthropological generalizations, obtains both among the Kachin and the various Kuki and Naga tribes. Of the Tibeto-Burman peoples only the Garo and Kabha, in the Barish group, are known to have matrilineal descent, and unfortunately we know nothing of the cousin terminology in use among these tribes. There is a hint of the Crow type of terminology in Bodo, also in the Barish group, but we cannot be sure that the Bodo reckon descent in the matrilineal line. Bodo (nang-)a-doi "(thy) oBCh", (a-)doi FyB show reciprocity, as has already been pointed out, but Bodo nam-ba-noi "(thy) SiS", (nang-)a-noi "(thy) SiD", and a-noi FSi cannot be explained on this basis and suggest rather the Crow pattern. It is greatly to be regretted that our Garo sources fail us at this critical point.

SA
601 The Kachin system, which is quite distinct from that found
193 in Kukish, merits especial examination. The key terms are as
197 follows:

ST

Kachin Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

601 moi FSi — ts'a MB,MBS(ws)
193 ning xCi(ws) — k'au xCe(ms)
197 k'ri FSiD(ms),SiCh(ms)
rat MBD(oms)
nam MBD(yms),BCh(ws)

(Affinal)

ni WL,MBW,WBW — ku HF,FSiH,HoB,oSiH(ws)
moi HM — ts'a WF,BWB(ws)
ning HSi,BW(ws) — k'au WB,SiH(ms)
nam Di,WySi,yBW(ms),WBCh — k'ri Si,HSiCh,FSiHSi
rat WoSi,ySiH(ws),oBW(ms),HyB

The main features of this system have already been discussed in pt. 7. It will be observed that the lineal equations characteristic of the Omaha pattern appear only in the terms for non-marriageable cross-cousins under the Kachin unilateral xC marriage arrangement, i.e. a man equates his (non-marriageable) FSiD with his SiCh, while a woman equates her (non-marriageable) MBS with her MB. The terms applied by a woman to her (marriageable) FSiS are not known, but a man equates his (marriageable) MBD with his WSi. Distinct terms are used by speakers of each sex for xC(ss).

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

On the basis of comparative material, the terms nau and k'ri must be regarded as originally affinal (Dl and Sl, respectively). Both terms have "invaded" the consanguineal nomenclature via the categorical equations Dl= BD(ws) and Sl=SiS(ms), as are consistent with the practice of MBD marriage. Note that both terms have become neuter in the course of this transformation. We must next enquire of the fate of the original xN terms thus displaced. The terms moi FSi and ts'a MB can be called upon at this point. We lack comparative material on moi, but Tibetan has ts'a SiS(ms) corresponding to the Kachin term, and we can therefore interpret Kachin ts'a MB as a product of reciprocal usage. We have conclusive support for this view in the term k'ri HSiCh, FSiHSi, which at first puzzled the writer. Under the Kachin tripartite organization, as described by Gilhodes, FSiHSi becomes MBW, and MBW ~ HSiCh are reciprocal terms. Since moi FSi closely parallels ts'a MB, we are justified in interpreting this term analogically as a reciprocal development from BD(ws).

To continue our analysis, moi and ts'a have displaced the original cross FSb terms ni and ku, which are retained in the affinal nomenclature. An original system of bilateral xC marriage must be postulated to account for ni WZ, MBW < FSi, and ku HF, FSiH < MB. The categorical equations shown by ning xCi(ws) = Sil(ws) and k'au xCe(ms) = Bl(ms) also call for this type of marriage.

To complete our reconstruction, the terms ning, k'au, and rat must be regarded as originally consanguineal rather

SA than affinal. We have comparative material only for ning,
601 which is represented by Chang (Konyak) nyŭng < *ning xC,
193 Nikir neng < *ning BW(ws). We must further reconstruct rat
197 as the term for xC(ds), i.e. the marriageable xC under the
ST original bilateral xC marriage arrangement. This yields the
●601 theoretical categorical equations xCi(ms)=Sil(ms) and xCe(ws)=
193 Bl(ws). Under the conventional type of levirate, which is
197 found among the Kachin, a distinction must be made between the (marriageable) oBW and the (non-marriageable) yBW. In Kachin this distinction is made, in the case of a man, by equating yBW with Dl (nam) and in retaining the term rat for oBW, and, in the case of a woman, by equating HoB with HF (ka) and in retaining the term rat for HyB. Since a man marries his MBD, the distinction between rat MBD(oms) and nam MBD(yms) is the natural result of that described above. It is a fair inference that the missing terms for FSiS(ws) are ka FSiS(ows) and rat FSiS(yws). Note that the equation of MBD(yms) with BCh(ws) is a by-product, so to speak, and is not to be taken as a 'Crow' feature.

We are now in a position to evaluate the Omaha features of the Kachin system. It has been demonstrated that the Kachin have developed a unilateral xC marriage system from an original bilateral arrangement, and that this shift has produced a profound transformation in the kinship terminology. The equating of MBS(ws) with MB, and of FSiD(ms) with SiCh(ms) serves to distinguish the non-marriageable from the marriageable

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

cross-cousins. These equations closely parallel those already noted in the Sbl terminology, and appear to form part of the same pattern. If this inference be correct, we must regard the institution of the levirate as a contributing factor here.

The Kachin terminology under the original bilateral xC marriage system can be reconstructed as follows:

Reconstructed Kachin System

(Consanguineal)

ni	FSi	hk	MB
ning	xCi(ws)	k'au	xCe(ms)
	rat xC(ds)		
moi	HD(ws)	ts'a	SiS(ms)

(Affinal)

ni	MBW,Ml	hk	FSiH,Fl
ning	Sil(ss)	k'au	Bl(ss)
	rat Sbl(ds)		
nam	Dl	k'ri	Sl

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, show Omaha features of Kachin type, e.g. Lashi so-ok FSiD(ms),SiCh(ms) and zo-auk Sl (a variant of so-ok), directly comparable with the Kachin term k'ri. Our material here is too uncertain to justify any further investigation of this point, and we have no data on the Maru and Lashi marriage practices. Both tribes are closely identified with the Kachin, and have even incorporated Kachin loan-words into their kinship nomenclatures, so that direct Kachin influence must be reckoned with in this

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

matter. To judge from what little we know of the collateral terms of other Burmish-Lolo1sh languages, Omaha features are not present. There is some evidence suggesting that the root *tu is applied both to M and C in Lisu and in Ulu (Northern Lolo), but the Lisu material is inconsistent and the Ulu material is not precise

The Omaha nomenclatures found among the Kukish tribes are quite distinct in type from the Kachin nomenclature. The Kuki tribes proper, including Southern Kuki and Tangkhul, employ the following basic scheme (in many varieties):

Kuki Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

pi gM,MBD — pu gF,MB,MBS

ni FSi

tu FSiCh,SiCh(ms),gCh

(Affinal)

pi MBW,WM,WSi — pu WF,WB

ni HM — -rang FSiH,HF

mou DI,BW(ws) — mak SI,SiH(ws)

Lushei has an especial term for BCh(ws), viz. va' (apparently connected with the root *wa H), and Yindu has an especial term for BD(ws), viz. (ka-)li, which has been compared with the root *ma-li gCh (Burmese, Nung), xM (Mikir). In Siyin and Chawte, however, BCh(ws) is equated with Ch. The analyzing development in Laiyo has entirely obliterated all traces of the Omaha system, yet the term tu FSiCh is

SA 601 193 197 retained. Haka has both (k-)tu FSiCh and the analytical term (k-)ni fa as an alternative. Lakher applies Sb terms (in address) to FSiCh and occasionally to MBCh, and both Thado and Aimol sometimes apply the oSb term to FSiCh(os). Chinbok employs an analytical term for MBS, but equates MBD with MySi.

ST ●601 193 197 Thado resembles Chinbok in equating MBD with MSi, but elsewhere the regular equation is with MBW = gM. Chinbok is further aberrant in equating FSiS with SiS(ms) but having a distinct term for gS. Yindu equates DS with SiS, FSiS, but employs an analytical term for SS. Yindu has distinct terms for MBCh, and Kyaw has distinct terms both for MBCh and FSiCh(i.e. Omaha features are lacking). Aimol, if we can trust our sources, has reversed the Kuki pattern, with (ka-)pu FSiS and (ka-)tu-pa MBS. Chinbon has MoBS = MyB, MyBS = WB, reflecting the stress placed on age distinctions in Southern Kuki. Our Chawte material, which is not reliable, indicates a distinction between FSiS(ws) and FSiD(ms), and the equation of SiCh(mws) with gCh. The affinal term mak Sl is commonly replaced by the consanguineal term tu SiS(ms), as in Haka, Chawte, and Sho, and the reverse process whereby an affinal term "invades" the consanguineal nomenclature (as in Kachin) is illustrated by Kyaw sa-mak SiCh(ms) = Sl, and Ayaing Khami mok-sa FSiCh, SiCh(ms) = Sl, both from the root *mak Sl. The latter language has retained the root *tu, however, in the term (ka-)tu FSiCh(ws), gS.

It is evident from the above citations that this Omaha pattern is extremely susceptible to variation at all points.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 Nothing approaching the specific Kachin variety has been encountered, however, and the two systems seem to have little in common. In the Kuki system the equations FSiCh=SiCh(ms) and MBS=MB obtain regardless of the sex or speaker, there are additional equations of MB with gF and SiCh(ms) with gCh, and ni FSi is retained as a consanguineal term. In addition, distinct terms for xC(ss) and Sbl are lacking. The historical developments of the two systems have been quite different, if we are permitted to draw inferences from comparative data. The terms pi and pu are the original gP terms (TB *p'i gM, *p'u gF), and the term -rang (prefixed) can be regarded as the original term for MB, cognate with Tibetan ?a-ʒang < *zrang MB (cf. Kachin ku HF,FSiH=MB). The term tu occasions some difficulty, since we have only the Burmish-Loloish root *tu and the Nung term pa-du, both applied to N (xN in Burmese) for comparison. In view of the parallelism in the equations MB=gF and xN=gCh, however, we must fix the original meaning of tu as "gCh" rather than "xN". The clue to these equations seems to be teknonymy in conjunction with xC marriage, i.e. we must suppose that a man applied the teknonymous terms pu gF and pi gM to his wife's parents, whereas a woman applied the consanguineal terms ni FSi and -rang MB. With the development of unilateral marriage with MBD, a feature found in the Kuki area as well as in Kachin, the two sets of Pl terms were fully differentiated in function, and the term pu Fl=gF replaced the consanguineal term -rang MB, with pi coming into

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 198 197

use for MBW. The equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh was the natural result of the above development. Since the term ni FSi was retained in its original setting, no comparable term was developed for the reciprocal relationship BCh(ws). The evidence for the use of teknonymous terms in Tibeto-Burman in general has been resumed above and need not be discussed at this point. Within the Kuki group, note Chinbon (ka-)mo-pauk WH=gF and (ka-)mu-bok MoB (probably a variant of the foregoing), (ka-)mo WM= gM and (ka-)mok MoBW (probably a variant of the foregoing), but (ka-)ze HF (analysis uncertain), (ka-)zi HM=FSi. Chinbon thus makes use of teknonymous terms precisely as suggested above for the Kuki group in general.

We are still faced with the problem of explaining the equations MBS= MB, MBD = MBW (or MSi), and FSiCh=SiCh(ms). Here again we must take into account the affinal setting of these terms under a system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD. The fundamental equation seems to have been that between WF and WB (pu) rather than between MB and MBS, i.e. these kin were identified because of the similarity of their roles as wife's father and brother rather than as mother's brother and mother's brother's son. In other terms, the especial position of MB and MBS among the Kuki groups seems in large measure to have arisen through xC marriage. The equation of FSiCh with SiCh(ms) reflects the equation of MBS with MB, just as the equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh reflects the equation of MB with gF.

It is possible to conceive of the Kuki development without recourse to teknonymy simply by assuming that pu gF was

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

applied to MB and MBS in an honorific sense, with tu gCh SiCh(ms)=FSiCh as a complementary equation. In any event, the equation in the MB line must be regarded as the primary one, and the equation in the FSi line as complementary. The same situation was found to obtain among the Kachin (supra).

The Naga languages, which make up the northern division of the Kukish group, also reveal Omaha features, which are of Kuki rather than Kachin type. MBD is equated with MSi or MySi rather than with gM=MBW. In Ao (all three dialects) the terms for gF (o-pu) and gCh (sam-cir) are distinct, i.e. there is no teknonymy, the TB root *k'u is retained in the consanguineal nomenclature (o-k'u MB,MBS) while MBD is equated with MySi, and the affinal terms for Sl (a-nok) and Dl (a-mu) are applied to FSiS,SiS(ms) and FSiD,SiD(ms), respectively, precisely as in Ayaing Khami. Sema has a distinct term for gF (neuter) and equates gCh with Ch, but has developed a new root for MB,MBS (a-ngu) and has retained the root *k'u only in the affinal meaning "FSiH" (a-ci). Thus both Ao and Sema show full Omaha features without distinction of sex of speaker (as in Kuki) but also without teknonymy (as in Kachin). The Angami, Rengma, and Lhota systems, however, all show teknonymous features. Rengma (all three dialects) equates MB,MBS(os) with gF (ggF in Nzong), and FSiCh,SiCh(ms) with gCh. Lhota shows a partial equation of MB,MBS with gF (o-mo and o-mo-tsü) and at least similar terms for FSiS,SiS(ms) and gS (o-hro and o-hre). Angami equates FSiS,ySiS(ms) with gS, but distinguishes between

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 gF and MB, yet the term for the latter (mi) is connected with the Rengma term for gF,MB (a-mi ~ a-mui) and the Lhota term for MB (o-mo) and gF (o-mo-tsü). We can thus interpret Angami mi MB as the original term for gF,MB and in this way explain the lack of symmetry in the Angami nomenclature as it now stands (a man calls his sister's child "gCh", but a child calls his mother's brother "uncle"). Angami lacks the Omaha traits on one side, since MBCh is addressed or described by name, or analytically if the need arises. The Rengma equations on the MB side appear only in the vocative nomenclature, and only when the cousin (MBS or MBD) addressed is older than speaker.

As noted in pt. 16, Majumder attempted to explain some of the features of the Sema nomenclature in terms of marriage with F's widow, after the fashion instituted by Rivers. Almost no instances of marriages of this type have been encountered in the Tibeto-Burman area, however, and the writer fails to see how Rivers' theories are of any relevancy in the present situation. The most curious form of marriage noted is the Lisu marriage with FSi cited by Fraser, and this is not reflected in the Lisu nomenclature. Omaha features among the Omaha and Miwok are perhaps based on WBD marriage, but for the American evidence there is no unanimity of opinion, and at least three recent writers on the subject (White, Gifford, Fax) have attacked this as a general explanation. Of this trio White alone suggests a general explanation, viz. that the Omaha type

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 is developed from the Dakota-Iroquois type (pC=Sb, xC distinct term) under the influence of a mature and vigorous patrilineal clan system. Gifford has successfully attacked this view on the basis of the American material, and the same general strictures are applicable in the Tibeto-Burman field, where no correlation can be established between strong patrilineal clans and the Omaha type of terminology.

The Kuki equation of xN with gCh is also encountered in Miri (ā < o-i "child below") and Tibetan (ts'a). Miri has retained the TB root *k'u MB (a-kū), but does apply teknonymous terms to F1 and M1 (= MB and FSi under the Miri bilateral xC marriage system). In Tibetan, however, teknonymy has been found only in the dialect of Bathang (eastern Tibet) as recorded by Desgodins, who cites rmo-rmo M1 = MM (hence a man's term for his WM). Abor shows reverse teknonymy in the shifts a-bu gF < F and a-mă gM < M, reflected in the equation o Ch = N = gCh (Abor, like Miri, applies teknonymous terms to F1 and M1).

SA 601 ST 601 We are perhaps not justified in concluding that all equations of xN with gCh are based on teknonymy involving the affinal nomenclature (gF > F1 = MB), but no better general explanation can be suggested. The general thesis outlined above conforms to the basic Tibeto-Burman sociological pattern of cross-cousin marriage, and thus enjoys an initial advantage over any alternative theories of a more an hoc nature.

Reciprocal terminology has already been mentioned in connection with Kachin ts'a MB < SiCh(ms), k'ri HBiCh, FSiHBi,

SA 601 ST 601 and Bodo a-doi FyB, nang-a-doi oBCh. This phenomenon is not typical of Tibeto-Burman but can be traced in a few languages. Newari ni-ni FSi, i-ni Dl (< HD,ws) is comparable with Kachin ts'a. The following instances of grandparental reciprocity have been noted: Lepcha a-zo ggF ∿ a-zon gCh (with -n suffix); Bodo a-bau gF,gCh, Moran a-lu gF,gCh (as cited by Gurdon); Lisu a-lɛ̄ ggF, lɛ̄-pa gS (and perhaps a-za gM, za S), which are not strictly reciprocal. Note also Lushei t'laˀ "a descendant, posterity", t'laˀ-tu "an ancestor, progenitor" (apparently formed with the root *tu gCh), Siyin tu-k'an ta-k'an "descendant; ancestor", based on tu < *tu gCh and ta < *za Ch. Lisu also has the combined terms pa-la "F and Ch", ma-la "M and Ch", and pi-li "gF and gCh", all used in a collective sense. Kanauri spats gCh seems to have been derived from a-pa F, with the diminutive suffix -ts as in a-pats FB and the s- prefix as in Tib. p'a-spad "F and Ch" (collective).

To resume the foregoing discussion, we have reconstructed for the Tibeto-Burman peoples a sociological pattern of bilateral xC marriage and a corresponding linguistic pattern with primary terms for MB and FSi, for Sl, and perhaps for Dl, but with the affinal nomenclature in general based on categorical equations. In the Lowie system this pattern would be designated "bifurcate merging". The breakdown of the xC marriage pattern is shown to have directly influenced the affinal nomenclature but to have exerted little effect on the consanguineal nomenclature. The development of unilateral xC

SA 601 ST 601

marriage with MBD in Kachin and the Kuki and Naga tribes is associated with the presence of two sets of F1 terms and of Omaha features in the collateral terminology. This association naturally has no statistical significance, yet fits very well into the general picture.

The practice of unilateral xC marriage with MBD is to be interpreted in terms of asymmetric reckoning of descent, as has been brilliantly pointed out by B. Z. Seligman with especial reference to River's Pentecost material. The Pentecost society has matri-moieties with three patri-sections in each, and the Pentecost terminology shows Crow features, viz. ratahina W,WBi,FSi,FSiD, and nituna WBCh,Ch. The Pentecost pattern is thus the reverse of the Kachin-Kuki-Naga.

The Tibeto-Burman evidence is surprising, perhaps, in failing to suggest a basic pattern of dual organization. Rivers regarded xC marriage as the result of dual organization, and Radcliffe-Brown has expressed the belief that the "Dravidian-Australian" kinship system (xC marriage) is in some way correlated with dual organization. The latter point of view is perhaps that shared by the majority of anthropologists. In the Tibeto-Burman area, however, dual organization has been recorded only for some of the Old Kuki groups and for Garo and Rabha, with additional evidence from the Naga group. Bose (1934) has collected much material bearing on this point, but largely from inadequate sources and in wholly uncritical fashion. In a later article (1937) the same writer places

SA
.601
ST
.601

emphasis rather on the tri-clan arrangement as found among at least some sections of the Garo, and suggests that an originally matrilineal people had been submerged in a wave of patrilineal peoples coming from the north, and that the restriction against a woman's marrying into her mother's clan is a reflection of this matrilineal substratum. Another Indian ethnologist, Das (1935), postulates a mixture of a patrilineal people with dual organization and a matrilineal people. The Khasi are typically matrilineal, and hence one can easily envisage an archaic Khasi-Mon matrilineal substratum in the Assam-Burma area. The Tibeto-Burman peoples, on the other hand, were and are patrilineal, though practising xC marriage. The Garo, Rabha, and probably other members of the Barish linguistic stock are matrilineal, however, apparently through direct Khasi influence. The theory of a miscegenation between patrilineal and matrilineal peoples, as advocated by Bose and Das, is therefore likely enough, and serves as well as any other as a partial explanation of the development of the asymmetric mode of reckoning descent. It does not explain, however, why the Kachin, living in the upper Irrawaddy valley, should have adopted this feature, nor, inversely, why the Mikir, in close contact with the Khasi, should not have adopted it.

In the present study no effort can be made to follow through the historical and other implications raised by the postulation of an early Tibeto-Burman-speaking population with patrilineal descent and xC marriage. It is difficult to see

SA 601 ST 601 any historical connection with the "Dravidian-Australian" system suggested by Radcliffe-Brown (see also the articles by Hodson and Rivers), inasmuch as an intervening population of matrilineal Mon-Khmer-speaking peoples must also be postulated. From another point of view, the writer is unable to suggest any striking correlation between xC marriage and other cultural traits. According to the view expressed by Kroeber in a recent article (1938), this form of marriage would form part of the "secondary pattern" and would be (ultimately) referable to factors of residence or other elements of the "basic pattern". The argument seems to be that one must live somewhere, but can live without exogamic groupings, totems, and the like - that one must have kin, but not clans. It is equally true, however, that one must marry someone, and that his choice must lie either within the kin group or without, just as residence must be either patrilocal, matrilocal, or neither, with various combinations possible. This point of view seems to be implied in Seligman's (1929) discussion of incest and descent factors.

It is perhaps of some interest to point out that pre-marital sexual promiscuity and the institution of a bachelor's house or its equivalent are characteristic Tibeto-Burman traits. The writer has not collected data on either of these specific points, yet has been impressed by the almost universal distribution of these features. It is primarily among acculturated groups such as the Tibetans or Burmese that these traits are in abeyance. Contrast, for example, the primitive Almora

SA 601 ST 601 group with xC marriage and a type of bachelor's house with their immediate neighbors, the Tibetans, who practise polyandry rather than xC marriage (traces of the latter persist) and have nothing suggesting a bachelor's house. The same type of contrast is presented by the primitive Arakanese with xC marriage and premarital sexual freedom (Hutchinson, p. 113) and the sophisticated Burmese, who lack xC marriage and whose courtship pattern had become highly formalized even in medieval times (vide the interesting account by Kin). It is not suggested that xC marriage and premarital sexual laxity are necessarily correlated in any way, but, in the area under consideration, both appear to belong to the same general cultural stratum.

****

SA [121] ST [121] The present study is of limited scope and comparative material has therefore been eliminated. The parallelism between the Kuki Omaha pattern and that found among the BaThonga and Nama Hottentot of South Africa, however, is too attractive to be omitted. The Nama Hottentot (Schapera, pp. 230 and ff.) employ the terms //náob g^{o},MB; //náos g^{o},MBW (but MB is now called oneb < Dutch oom "uncle", and MBW is now called mugis < Dutch moekie "little mother"); //núrib xCo,SiS(ms),gS; //núris xCi,SiD(ms),gD. This system can be converted into the Kuki type by limiting //núrib and //núris to FSiCh and applying //náob and //náos to MBCh. Schapera describes xC marriage of bilateral type, but notes that among

SA 601 ST 601 some tribes of the Nama marriage with MBD "is said to have been far more common" (p. 244). For the replacement of the MB term by the Dutch loan-word (omob < oom), cf. the widespread Tibeto-Burman borrowing of the Indic term māmā MB (infra).

The BaThonga evidence (Junod, pp. 216 and ff.) is complicated by the existence of dialectical differences. The regular MB term is malume (Zulu malume MB), applied also to MBS. The Northern BaThonga, however, have kokwana gF,MB,MBS, ntukulu SiS(ms),gS. The BaRonga clans are in a neatly transitional stage, with alternative sets of terms. Radcliffe-Brown (1924) has made an illuminating analysis of the BaThonga material, in which the significance of the terms malume ("male mother") and rarana ("female father") is pointed out (cf. also Firth's discussion of the FBi as "male father" in Tikopia). The BaThonga do not practice xC marriage, according to Junod, and the parallelism with Kuki thus breaks down at this point. Since the application of kokwana gF to MB is apparently of late origin here, the teknonymy principle is of no avail in this instance, and we must accept Radcliffe-Brown's mode of reasoning. Note that neither the Nama nor the BaThonga system is of true Omaha type.

****

SA 197 601 ST 197 601 Loan-words appear in many of the Tibeto-Burman kinship terminologies, and include terms of Indic, Chinese, and Shan origin, as well as of Tibeto-Burman origin. Indic loan-words are found in a string of languages extending from Baltistan

SA 197 601 ST 197 601

and Kanawur in the northwest to the Garo Hills in the southeast, all exposed to direct Indian influence. The extent of borrowing in kinship nomenclature is in general correlated with the rate of borrowing in general, but this is not necessarily so, e.g. Magari has preserved a large proportion of its original TB vocabulary yet has retained only a single kinship term (za Ch), if we can trust our sources. The tendency to borrow terms for male kin rather than female kin has been observed in Balti, Kanauri, Newari (less well marked), Miri, and Bariah. Terms for relatives older than speaker are also more likely to be borrowed than those for relatives younger than speaker. Probably both points can be explained on the basis of the honorific connotations associated with loan-words in general, which go to make up the "respectable" idiom as opposed to the vulgar. The term mama MB has been borrowed by Balti, Kanauri, Dhimal, Bodo, Garo, and perhaps Meithei, whereas the Indic FSi term has been borrowed only once (Dhimal).

The most prominent instances of borrowings made within Tibeto-Burman are those of Lepcha from Tibetan, and Atsi from Kachin. To illustrate the vagaries in the borrowing process, Atsi borrows its MB and FSi terms from Kachin but retains its native FB and MSi terms, whereas Byangsi (Almora group) borrows from Indic (Khasiya) its terms for FoB and FyB but employs a native term for MB. The borrowing of a term in a specialized sense only is exemplified by the following curious series: Kanauri mak-pa "Si living in Fi's house" (from Tibetan); Lepcha kn-mok, id. (from Tibetan); Kachin

SA 197 601 ST 197 601 luk-k'i, id. (from Shan). All three languages have distinct Sl terms applied under normal conditions. Contrast Garo nok-rong "Sl living in Fl's house" (native term), cowari "Sl other than above" (from Indic); note that among the Garo the nok-rong is a formalized institution in a matrilineal society. It would be difficult to find a more ideal illustration of the mirroring of sociological features in linguistic phenomena.

Bibliography [1]

SA 113 ST 113

Bose, J. K.

1934. Dual Organisation in Assam. UCJDL 25, no. 8.

1937. Origin of Tri-clan and Marriage-classes in Assam. Man 37, Correspondence, 110.

Das, T. C.

1935. Kinship and Social Organization of the Purum Kukis of Manipur. UCJDL 28, no. 6.

Firth, R.

1930. Marriage and the Classificatory System of Relationship. JRAI LX. 235-68.

Gifford, E. W.

1940. A Problem in Kinship Terminology. AA 42. 190-94.

Hodson, T. C.

1925. Notes on the Marriage of Cousins in India. MI 5, nos. 3 and 4.

Hutchinson, R. H. S.

1906. An Account of the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Calcutta.

1 [For abbreviations, see this source in cat. 113, ALI Southeast Asia ALI -- Analyst]

3. Chinese

12h
601

In the present section the writer proposes to examine the Chinese system of nomenclature with reference to the basic Tibeto-Burman system reconstructed above. Our interest naturally lies in the early Chinese system rather than in the later developments, for it is here that significant points of resemblance can be expected to appear. We shall devote our attention, therefore, to "Ancient Chinese" rather than to "Chinese" in general.

Our analysis has been made possible by the definitive work by Feng, to whom the anthropological world owes a lasting debt of gratitude. Just how great a debt this is can be realized only after a comparison has been made with the early crude account by Morgan (based on material supplied by Hart, an English customs official), the not-so-early but equally inadequate description by Hu, and even the more recent work by Chen and Shryock, which suffers from a grievous want of historical perspective. Feng has provided us with a detailed account of Chinese kinship nomenclature from the earliest period down to the present, based on carefully checked sources which are handled in the competent manner seldom attained even by our foremost European sinologues. A fair proportion of illustrative material is incorporated, and Chinese characters are cited. It is from this excellent source that the writer has drawn most of the material cited in this study.

121
601

Feng's work is incomplete only with respect to the modern dialects of China. Dialectical vocative terms are cited, and the developments behind some of the modern terms are brought to light, but the treatment is essentially literary throughout. For the modern dialects as such we must turn to isolated descriptions of individual dialectical patterns, e.g. May's account of Cantonese nomenclature. The single exception here is furnished by Fei's analysis of the kinship terms employed in the dialects of Wukiang (Kiangsu), Shanghai, Hangchow (Chekiang), Tungchow (Hopei), Amoy (Fukien), and Lanchow (Kansu), representing three major dialectical groups (Mandarin, Shanghai, Fukien). Fei devotes most of his attention to the vocative terms, which he regards as "more directly connected with the social organization" (p. 128).

From the present point of view, the main defect in Feng's work lies in the almost entire absence of linguistic treatment. Feng refers to his own method of approach as "primarily historical and linguistic" (p. 147), but from his footnote to this page we can see that he employs the term 'linguistic' in a greatly generalized sense. A truly linguistic approach calls for the use of archaic forms rather than of the phonetically degenerate Mandarin forms of the present day, and for an attempt, at least, to point out the affinities of these terms, both within and without Chinese. The employment of archaic forms, even in a

121
601 normalized orthography, would have removed the confusion produced by (modern) homonyms such as fu < b'iu (父) F, fu < piu (夫) H, fu < b'i u (婦) SW; cf. Kroeber's uncertainty on this point in his analysis of the material presented by Chen and Shryock (p. 152).

601 [121] The writer has attempted to supply the linguistic treatment lacking in Feng's work. The forms cited are those of Ancient Chinese, as reconstructed for approximately A. D. 600. The still earlier Archaic Chinese language of the first millenium B. C. has also been reconstructed in part, but our authorities in this field (notably Karlgren, Simon, Li Fang-kuei, and Chao Yüan-jên) disagree on many important points. The problems of a purely linguistic nature in this connection are manifold and cannot be entered upon in the present review, though occasional points are discussed below. The Ancient Chinese forms cited are slightly normalized variants of those found in Karlgren's well known Analytic Dictionary. In Karlgren's orthography, adopted here in the interest of uniformity, ɐ represents the vowel of Eng. 'but', and a the vowel of Eng. 'all'.

The ancient system of nomenclature is that recorded in the Êrh Ya and the early ritual works (Li Chi), supplemented by occasional gleanings from other classical works such as the Tso Chuan and Mencius. Our data on this ancient system are not complete, but enough of it is known to provide a good basis for discussion. In the tabulation below only the more significant terms are included. Modern Mandarin forms are cited within parentheses.

601

Ancient Chinese Consonantal Terms

yiwang-mou (王 wang) gM	tsuo (祖 tsu) gF yiwang-b'iu (王 wang) gF
mou (母 mu) M	b'iu (父 fu) F
da'iwong-mou (倀 ts'ung) MM1	da'iwong-b'iu (倀 ts'ung) FB
	shi-b'iu (世 shih) FoB
kuo (姆 mu) FM1	g'iəu (舅 chiu) MB
tai (姊 tsǐ) oM1	xiwong (兄 hsiung) oB kuən (昆 k'un) oB
mâi (妹 mei) yM1	d'iei (弟 ti) yB
da'iwong-b'iu tai-mâi FMD	da'iwong-b'iu kuən-d'iei FBS
da'iwong-mou tai-mâi MM1D	da'iwong-mou kuən-d'iei MB1S
	pung (甥 shêng) xCe,S1S(ms)
	tə'iuĕt (出 ch'u) S1S(ms)
d'iĕt (卩 chih) DCh(ws)	
niwo (女 nü) D,BD(ms)	tai (子 tsǔ) S,BS(ms)
	suən (孫 sun) gS

Ancient Chinese Affixal Terms

kuo M1	g'iəu F1
i (婦 i) WM1	a (亞 ya) xM1H
sâm (嫂 sao) eMW	pung B1(ms)
b'iəu (婦 fu) D1	siwo (卩 hsü) S1

Notes:

The term tsuo 祖 has the basic signification of "ancestor", while yiwang < *qwang is the word for "king", cognate with ɣwang (皇 huang) "sovereign, imperial, august". The Êrh Ya

●601 prefixes the element ngwâi (外 wai) when these terms are applied to MF and MM, just as it prefixes ngwâi to the terms hwo and g'iəu when applied to WM and WF, respectively, but the unprefixed terms are also employed. In general, this early system dispenses with the use of categorical terms of this type, except in describing kin of the more remote collateral lines. It is only in the later systems that this type of descriptive nomenclature is fully developed.

The vocative terminology, both ancient and modern, shows much more variation than the descriptive (cf. Fei). Some of the more important F and gF terms are: kung (公 kung) gF (used as a title in early times); ung (翁 wêng) gF (probably etymologically related to the foregoing; cf. Pelliot, also Feng, note 55 to p. 215); ia (爺 yeh) F,gF; t'ie < *tia (爹 tieh) F (apparently developed in North China); pa (爸 pa) F (apparently developed in South China); b'wâ (婆 p'o) gM; nâi (奶 nai) gM (also applied to M in state of Ch'u); niang (娘 niang) M (also "[illegible] lady"); ma (媽 ma) M (the most [illegible] form).

The FB [illegible] in use at this early period in China conform fundamentally to Lowie's "bifurcate merging" type rather than to his "bifurcate collateral" type. The most common terms for MBi and FB appear to have been da'iwong-mou and da'iwong-b'iu, respectively, based on the words for M and F plus the element da'iwong "following". The term ðiði-b'iu FoB, formed with the element ðiði < *ðiði "generation", was also in general use. These combined terms were

601 gradually replaced by the terms puk (伯 po) "elder" and śiuk (叔 shu) "younger", first in combination with b'iu 弟 (as in the Li Chi) and later independently. Puk, one of the feudal titles, is also found in combination with xiwong cB and tai cBi, as if reinforcing the age distinctions implied in those terms, while śiuk was originally the categorical term applied to the third of a series of brothers. Paralleling the development of these independent terms for PoB and FyB, the affinal term i was applied to MBi as early as ca. 500 B. C. (the earliest recorded instance is found in the Tso Chuan) and has been retained in this meaning to the present day. The modern Chinese system is therefore of "bifurcate collateral" type, as pointed out by Kroeber and Chen and Shryock.

The four Sb terms appear in the earliest material and must be regarded as basic to the system. Of the pair of terms for cB, kuon seems to have been the older and xiwong the more recent; note that kuon-d'iei rather than xiwong-d'iei is employed in the cousin nomenclature. There are indications that d'iei could be used for "yBi" as well as "yB", and an especial character (㚘) for the term in this connotation is found in the Shih Ming (ca. A. D. 200).

In the modern dialects, the old terms for cBi and cB have in vocative usage been replaced by tsia (姐 chieh) and kê (哥 ko), respectively, whereas the terms for yBi and yB have been retained even in address. Thus Chinese, like Tibeto-Burman, attests to the generalization that terms

601 applied to kin older than speaker (or otherwise in a position calling for respect) are more susceptible to change than their complementary terms. Tsia is perhaps a variant of tsi (tsia< tsi-a). The term kâ appears in T'ang times in the meaning "F", and was only later (9th tp 10th centuries) applied to "oB". Pelliot has compared the prefixed form a-kâ with Turkic and Mongol aqa oB, but this Altaic form is relatively late. The equation oB= F also appears in xiwong (5th century A. D., as used among some royal families), and the parallel equation oSi= M both in tsi (applied to M in state of Ch'i) and tsia (applied to M throughout the Yangtze valley down to the 13th century). Comparable equations have been noted above for Tibeto-Burman (Section A).

The terms tsi S (tonally identical with tsi oSi) and suan gS are basically neuter (Ch and gCh), but are commonly employed in a masculine sense. Niwo D functions in combined terms as a feminine affix, e.g. suan-niwo (or niwo-suan) gD. Other terms for Ch are ńźie < ńia (兒 êrh) (a diminutive suffix in the modern language) and nuo (奴 nu), apparently the same word as nuo (奴 nu) "slave, servant" (this semantic association is found also in Kachin).

The collateral nomenclature presents an interesting contrast between the pC terms, formed in an analytical manner, and the xCe term geng. Feng (p. 171) is inclined to dismiss the Êrh Ya statement equating xCe with xNe as a later interpolation, and is unable to interpret the alternative term

601 ts'iuŏt xNe cited in the same source. In Mencius, however, ŋʊng is used in the meaning "Sl", which can be explained only if we assign the basic meaning "xNe" to this term. It would appear to the writer that ŋʊng and g'iəu are conceptually reciprocal terms paralleling d'iŏt and kuo, and that the use of ŋʊng in the meaning "xCe" represents an extension of the term. In the Êrh Ya classification, ŋʊng is placed in the Ch'i tang (妻黨) category, "Relatives through wife", hence the affinal affiliations of the term seem to have been uppermost in the minds of the compilers of this classic. The application to xCe perhaps represents an "invasion" of the consanguineal nomenclature via the equation of WH with DH. According to this interpretation, ŋʊng would originally have stood for "husband of a woman of Ego's clan"; cf. the development of the TB root *mak Sl in Kuki and Abor-Miri. Ts'iuŏt < t'iuŏt S1S(ms) and d'iŏt BCh(ws) appear to be variants of a single root, perhaps for xN(mws). The former is cited only in the Êrh Ya (the root is regularly used in the meaning "go out"), and thus can be regarded as of dialectical origin. The xN distinctions are reflected also in the terms lyie-suən (離昆 li) S1SS(ms), lit. "departing gS", and kyuie-suən (歸昆 kuei) BSS(ws), lit. "returning gS".

The classing of BCh (ms) with Ego's Ch, though not shown in the Êrh Ya (where these terms are lacking), can safely be inferred from the data supplied by Feng. A distinction began to appear in Han times, with the result that the term d'iŏt was shifted from BCh(ws) to BCh(ms) during the Chin period (265-420).

601 The affinal nomenclature presents basic categorical equations at three points (Fl= FSi, Fl= MB, Bl= xCe), all indicating xC marriage of bilateral type. Sêu oBH is perhaps a woman's term (Êrh Ye). This term is also employed in the meaning "matron", and may originally have been a general honorific; cf. sêu (搜 sou) "old man, sir" (on same tone and with same phonetic element). The term i < ?di WSi appears to have been applied only when the sisters married different men, i.e. under non-sororate conditions. This term has from early times been used for "WSi" (vide supra). The terms b'iêu Dl and siwo Sl are also employed for Y and Y, respectively, along with numerous other terms which do not merit consideration in this brief review. Finally, a WSiH can be interpreted as an extension of the word in its fundamental meaning "second, younger, inferior", since under a system of brother-sister exchange WSiH becomes Ego's B (we must suppose that the term was applied to WySiH=yB).

The correlation of the system of nomenclature just described with the ancient Chinese practices of cross-cousin marriage and the sororate has been noted by several writers on the subject, with Feng giving the most thorough account. Feng has further invoked the principle of teknonymy to account for a number of later developments in the system, notably the application of kuo FSi to WSi (from the 4th century on) and of g'iêu MB to WB (from the 10th century on). Granet has attempted to explain the same features in terms of irregular marriages between members of different generations,

601 e.g. the marriage of oSiD by a Han emperor, and of FFSiD (i.e. F's paternal xCi) by a T'ang emperor. Feng has convincingly refuted the arguments brought forward by Granet, and the writer has nothing to add on this point. Insofar as the present limited field of enquiry is concerned, Granet and his theories can be dismissed without loss.

A comparison of the ancient Chinese nomenclature with that reconstructed for Tibeto-Burman brings out some points of capital interest. Basically the two systems are identical or very nearly so. Both have primary terms for FSi and MB, as contrasted with MSi and FB terms formed through extensions of the terms for M and F, plus categorical elements of various types. Age distinctions are on the whole more prominent in Chinese, but not significantly so, e.g. the age distinctions in the PSb terms can be more than matched in Burmese and Southern Kuki. The two most serious points of discrepancy occur in the gP and Sb sets of terms. Chinese has nothing to match the TB primary roots *p'i gi and *p'u gə, though it must be noted that vocative terms are not lacking (vide supra). Chinese distinguishes between muâi ySi and d'iei yS, as opposed to the TB neuter term *nau ySb, yet there are indications that d'iei was originally a neuter term (ySb), as noted above. Muâi ySi was perhaps secondarily developed from the root represented by mau M, from a basic connotation "female" (Li Fang-kuei has suggested reconstructions calling for mau < *mwək, muâi < *mwak, the vocalism being determined by tone

601 The sex-of-speaker distinctions found in a number of TB languages do not appear in the Chinese Sb terms. Chinese has two well-attested terms for oB, however, and it might be argued that one of these was originally a man's term, the other a woman's term.

The agreement of the two systems in the affinal terminology, each showing categorical equations indicative of cross-cousin marriage, is undoubtedly the most significant single fact that has been unearthed in the course of our survey of Asiatic kinship. Since we have abundant evidence for cross-cousin marriage itself in both areas, as well as the terminologies in both linguistic families, the inference of an ancient cross-cousin marriage pattern becomes virtually inevitable.

This inference is further supported by an amazing piece of linguistic evidence. Scarcely any of the Chinese kinship terms can be identified as cognates of TB roots, despite the close agreements of the two kinship patterns (contrast Karen). The vocative terms ma M and pa F are of TB type, but the descriptive terms mau M (perhaps from *mwak or *mak) and b'iu F are apparently distinct from any roots in TB or Karen. The linguistic problems in connection with these terms, however, are extremely intricate, and it is doubtful whether they can successfully be attacked at the present stage of investigation. Thus, tsi S would appear to be cognate with a similar root found in Gyarung and Kanauri, but the archaic Chinese form may have been *tsig, since in the Shih Ching

601 (Book of Odes) tai (子) rhymes with tək (德), and its cognate dz'i (字) "to nourish, breed, cherish" rhymes with iək (翼). In the midst of all this uncertainty, however, we encounter the term g'iəu MB=Fl, which can beyond any reasonable doubt be identified with the TB root *k'u MB= Fl. As in other roots (cf. the root for "9" infra) the correspondence shown by the initials cannot be analyzed, though the unaspirated forms in Burmese and Kachin suggest that the TB root may have been *gu or *g'u rather than *k'u (both these languages regularly preserve initial aspiration). The finals, however, belong to one of the best established of all Sino-Tibetan phonetic series. The following set of roots is presented by way of illustration:

	Chinese	Tibetan	Kachin	Burmese
MB=Fl*	g'iəu (舅)	k'u	ku	kui
owl	g'iəu (鴞)	-	k'u	-
nine	kiəu (九)	dgu	ga-k'u	kui[3]
pigeon	kiəu (鳩)	k'u-**	-	k'ui

*Note: Tib. k'u FB; Kachin ku FBiH,HF,Bl; Burmese B (honorific prefix).

**Note: Tib. k'u-byug "cuckoo" (affiliation uncertain)

Such are the "fact in the case", whatever may be their significance. In Tibeto-Burman, as has been shown, the root *k'u MB is much less stable than *ni FBl, yet in the linguistic substratum common to Tibeto-Burman and Chinese it is the former and not the latter root that has been preserved. Under a system of cross-cousin marriage in conjunction with patrilineal

601 descent, however, MB=Fl rather than FBl=Hl should be the pivotal relationship, hence the problem is a two-sided one. No likely solution is at hand, and the writer will content himself merely by posing this as a final problem.

113 Bibliography [1]

Chen, T. S. and Shryock, J. K.

1932. Chinese Relationship Terms. AA 34. 623-69.

Fei, H. T.

1936. The Problem of Chinese Relationship System. MS 2. 125-48.

Feng, H. Y.

1936. Teknonymy as a Formative Factor in the Chinese Kinship System. AA 38. 59-66.

1937. The Chinese Kinship System. HJAS 2, no. 2.

Karlgren, B.

1923. Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese. Paris.

Kroeber, A. L.

1933. Process in the Chinese Kinship System. AA 35. 151-5

May, A. J.

1894. Chinese Relationships. CR 21. 15-39.

Pelliot, P.

1931. Review of Fu Ssŭ-nien "Sur les cinq rangs de noblesse féodale". TP 28. 486-8.

1 [For abbreviations, see this sourc in cat. 113, ALI Southeast Asia ALI -- Analyst]

23: Benedict
601

AL1 Southeast Asia
Sino-Tibetan Border
Peoples AE3

/For a linguistic confirmation of the kinship terms used in this source, see category 197./

23: Benedict
113, 197, 601

ALl Southeast Asia
Sino-Tibetan Border
Peoples AE3

/For a linguistic reconstruction of the kinship terminology of the Moso, Lisu, Nyi, Ahi, and Lolopho, see ALl Southeast Asia, 23: Benedict, category 116, pp. 205-235./